

he does inspires those around him to strive to do better. Other handicapped workers in my community encourage able-bodied persons in a similar manner.

The rehabilitation of several patients has been aided by the pictures painted by a former chief of police of our town, whose body was badly paralyzed by a sniper's bullet. He also narrates a weekly radio program that gives the public a better understanding of law enforcement.

A demand is growing for the seashell decorated bottles and placecards made by a polio-crippled mother and flute teacher. She does telephone contact work for various organizations, and the club members greatly appreciate her work as a club historian.

The handicapped have helped themselves and others through carpentry and construction of various devices. One man has built several exercising aids for those that are hospitalized or bedridden in rest homes.

Outstanding poems and books have been written by two crippled people in this community. One young lady is working on her second book of poetry, and the man at the newsstand is writing his third book.

The crafts and hobbies of the handicapped have provided many homes with rugs, pictures, picture frames, etchings, leatherwork, ceramics, plastic articles, and seasonal decorations. These are not products bought from sympathy but products of high quality that are often sold in competition with factory manufactured articles.

Physically handicapped mothers and fathers have been responsible for some of the happy, reputable families in our community. They are to be commended for doing well a task that too many able-bodied parents have done poorly.

It becomes increasingly apparent that handicapped workers are benefiting my community in as many innumerable ways as other groups of workers. Through the gradual acceptance of handicapped workers by employers and the public, many of the physically handicapped are beginning to live full and productive lives by forgetting what they can't do and doing what they can.

Stubborn Inequity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post, April 28, 1963:

STUBBORN INEQUITY

Once again, an effort is being made to delete from the laws a retirement pay provision that penalizes every officer who left active duty before the 1958 military pay bill went into effect. Before 1958, there was a century-old tradition of relating retirement benefits to active duty pay. But the military pay bill provided for 6 percent increases for officers who retired before June 1, 1958 and retained the traditional system only for those who subsequently left the service. It would be a simple matter—costing at most \$30 million—to correct the injustice, as the Department of Defense has urged.

Yet in the pending military pay legislation, Congress again fails to remedy the defect. By a 19 to 13 vote, the full House Armed Services Committee rejected the

unanimous subcommittee recommendation for removing the discriminatory feature. "This bill contains a major inconsistency," a minority of the full committee pointed out. "While purporting to encourage competent members of our Armed Forces to make lifetime careers of the military service, it breaks faith with those who have already devoted their lives to the service."

These sentences sum the matter up. Surely the House will amend the bill when it comes up on the floor, and thereby point the way to Senate adoption of a similar corrective. This legislative wrong has been a reproach to the country for altogether too long.

Tribute to James L. McDevitt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of James L. McDevitt, director of the AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education, in Oklahoma City on March 19, was a deep loss to many people in different walks of life. Because I believe my colleagues will want to know more about the life of this fine, unassuming man who worked consistently and effectively to make the voice of the working man heard in this country, I call attention to the April issue of the Plasterer and Cement Mason, in which Mr. McDevitt's life was memorialized.

The article follows:

[From the Plasterer and Cement Mason, April 1963]

PASSING OF JAMES L. McDEVITT LEAVES VOID IN RANKS OF LABOR

James L. McDevitt, vice president and executive board member of the O.P. and C.M.I.A., who died March 19 in Oklahoma City following a cerebral hemorrhage, was an outstanding labor leader at the local, State, and National levels.

As the director of the Committee on Political Education, Jim's particular union affiliation perhaps was not important to the large and varied groups of people he met all over the country, but his O.P. and C.M.I.A. membership always remained important to Jim. And O.P. and C.M.I.A. members everywhere were glad and proud that he was a member of their union.

Jim had gone to Oklahoma City to preside over one of a series of COPE regional conferences. He suffered a stroke on the morning of March 19 and another late that afternoon. He died the following morning.

Jim McDevitt was born in Philadelphia on Nov. 3, 1898, the son and grandson of plasterers. His grandfather, Charles McDevitt, came to this country from Ireland in 1849, at the age of 12 and settled in south Philadelphia. He was apprenticed out as a plasterer and in 1873 helped to found the Operative Plasterers' Mutual Protective Association. Charles had two sons, John and William, and both became plasterers and trade unionists. Jim was one of the five children of William McDevitt.

In 1923, when Jim became a candidate for recording secretary of local No. 8, it was said jokingly that his family vote was enough to elect him. He had been apprenticed in 1916, but his apprenticeship was interrupted by World War I. He enlisted in the Army in

1918, saw service in France and was honorably discharged in July 1919. He resumed his apprenticeship and became a journeyman plasterer in July 1920.

After being elected recording secretary of local No. 8, he went on to become president and business representative. It was during these days that he first met up with President Leonard, then business agent of local No. 31, Pittsburgh, and Secretary-Treasurer John J. Hauck, then business agent of local No. 592, Philadelphia. In 1928, he was elected president of the Philadelphia Building Trades Council.

In 1938, when AFL leaders in Pennsylvania needed someone to hold together a State federation badly split, they turned to McDevitt, who was then only 40 years old.

McDevitt's first years as State federation president were stormy, and the federation was so impoverished by the split in labor that McDevitt continued on the Unemployment Compensation Board of Review so that he could forego his salary as federation president.

In 1940, during the third term campaign of President Roosevelt, McDevitt's voice was one of the most powerful and persuasive raised in support of Roosevelt in Pennsylvania.

In 1947, the Pennsylvania State Federation established a permanent Committee on Political Action. Its purpose was to put the federation's political activities on an effective and continuing basis. The first test came in the 1948 elections. The committee set out to reach the federation's 700,000 membership. It sponsored mass meetings, bought time on radio stations and space in newspapers and published quantities of its own literature to get its message across. McDevitt predicted that the liberal-labor vote in Pennsylvania would defeat 10 Congressmen who had voted for Taft-Hartley. Experienced reporters covering the campaign thought he was talking through his hat, but the returns showed that 11, not 10, Taft-Hartley Congressmen were defeated in Pennsylvania.

McDevitt once said that he grew up "more or less a Democrat because in Republican Philadelphia it was the only thing a sincere trade unionist could be." Nevertheless, he could commend Republicans who had been fair to labor and criticized Democrats when they menaced labor's interests. He once commended Republican Gov. Edward Martin for a "glorious triumph" and he once told President Truman he was emulating the dictators when he asked for a "draft labor" law.

Expressing, once, the political philosophy of COPE, he said, "We believe that the well-being, the security, the freedom from economic fear and the dignity of each person should be the first concern of each legislator whether it be in the State capitals or Washington."

In his years in Pennsylvania, McDevitt served on many State agencies under appointment by the Governor. In 1948, he and President Edward J. Leonard (then vice president) were designated by the U.S. Secretary of Labor as representatives of all labor in the United States at the World Safety Conference of the International Labor Organization, held in Geneva, Switzerland.

Jim McDevitt's activities in the fight against intolerance are reflected in the positions he had held on such groups as the executive committee of the State Council for Fair Employment Practices, the American Council for Christians and Jews, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the National Trade Council for Palestine.

McDevitt was named a vice president of the O.P. & C.M.I.A. in 1954 to fill a vacancy caused by the death of James M. Myles, who also had been a prominent citizen of

quickly they are taken to the processing plants.

Mr. MATTHEWS. The best definition of the way they are harvested is pointed out in the record, which says that the peanuts are marketed before drying or removal of moisture by natural or artificial means. They pull up the vines and they handpick the peanuts. That is the way they are handled.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Cuba file
Only by United Leadership Can Cuban Crisis Be Solved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 6, 1963

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, in the following editorial, Mr. Mason C. Taylor, the distinguished editor of both the Pulitzer Prize winning *Utica Daily Press* and *Utica Observer-Dispatch* calls for a new bipartisan unity of purpose with respect to the Cuban threat. Furthermore, he cites the need for a more forthright and frank disclosure of foreign policy facts to the American people. In addition, he suggests that Members of Congress can play an important role in providing leadership.

I commend this editorial to the thoughtful consideration of the House:

[From the *Utica Daily Press*, Apr. 27, 1963]

ONLY BY UNITED LEADERSHIP CAN CUBAN CRISIS BE SOLVED

(By Mason C. Taylor)

It was just 4 years ago Wednesday of last week that Fidel Castro told a capacity throng of editors and their guests in Washington's Hotel Statler ballroom that one of his major objectives in Cuba was to ward off communism.

It was 2 years ago that President Kennedy appeared before the same editors just after the Bay-of-Pigs fiasco and said that there was a limit to U.S. patience and restraint in dealing with Communist penetration of Cuba.

Last week, the specters of the puppet Castro and his Soviet masters still remained in the Statler ballroom as the American Society of Newspaper Editors gathered once again to hear over a 3-day period some of the topmost leaders in government and politics. For it was Cuba, rather than Laos, space exploration, or the state of the economy that provoked the most serious discussion and interest.

Senator KEATING, of Rochester, charged that the administration was as puzzled, bewildered, and uncertain as the American people on how to deal with Castro and the Communist takeover. He claimed that more Russians have gone in Cuba than have come out, and that the Navy has orders not to search small vessels moving in Cuban and Caribbean waters at night. He urged a return to the bipartisanship of the Roosevelt-Vandenberg era for the development of a long-term, consistent program to dislodge the Soviets.

In his speech to the editors the next day, the President for some strange reason chose the domestic economy as his topic, but he did answer questions about Cuba.

In his answers, he reiterated the resolve not to permit troops to move from Cuba to other countries, or to tolerate use of Soviet troops against Cubans. He said again that under present conditions, he was opposed to an invasion or a blockade. He declared that in the light of our worldwide responsibilities, he believed present policy, which includes attempts to isolate Cuba, was the right one.

But it was former Vice President Nixon who got the greatest applause with his proposal of a new freedom doctrine for the Americas, with open support for all Communist-controlled regimes, including Cuban exiles, and "whatever action is necessary" to force removal of the Soviet beachhead in Cuba.

Mr. Nixon derided the idea that anything is to be gained by treating Khrushchev gently, or that things may get better if we wait awhile. The Communists, he said, do not hesitate to say that their goal is world conquest, or that they will aid revolutionary, Communist-type movements anywhere in the world. We should answer that our goal is nothing less than a free Russia, a free Eastern Europe, and a free China, he said. Only such a goal—deeply believed in, selflessly worked for was worthy of a great people and capable of blunting the Communist offensive and regaining the initiative for the cause of freedom, Mr. Nixon declared.

These speeches and some others at the convention made headlines across the Nation. Our guess is that the sum total of their effect may well be to add to public dissatisfaction with what is being done or not being done to resolve the Cuban crisis.

With trouble breaking out in Laos, with Berlin a potential trouble spot, the President faces a dilemma in deciding how far to go and where. While the final decisions are his, assorted members of the Kennedy team, State Department advisers and McNamara and company share in the discussions that precede decisions—when made.

These are all great minds, but are they enough? These are critical times. When you consider, in this nuclear age, the consequences of wrong moves or wrong decisions, the dangers perhaps are greater than at any time in our history.

It is no time for partisan sniping, or for angry resentment by administration spokesmen to honest questionings and sincere criticism. It is, rather, a time for a true spirit of bipartisanship such as has not existed since World War II.

In this era of televised public events and press conferences, the managed "image" of those in high office, plus an excess of legislative hickering, the role and stature of Congress have diminished these last few years. The voices of leadership or potential leadership are drowned in the cacophony of hero worship to which the public has become addicted.

This should not be. As the elected representatives of the people, members of Congress have a role that should not be minimized. There should be, as Senator Keating has said, better communication between the executive branch and the Congress. This is the first and necessary step toward bipartisan unity of purpose, and one which should be initiated by the President. Another is a more candid disclosure of facts to the American people.

With united leadership, united responsibility and united purpose a firm policy inevitably will emerge that can represent the will and determination of the American people—a determination against which none can prevail.

How My Community Benefits From the Abilities of Handicapped Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 23, 1963

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a prize-winning essay written by Galen Bollinger of Caldwell, Idaho, on the subject of "Ability Counts." The essay deals with the accomplishments of handicapped workers and the benefits their activities bring to a community. The contest was sponsored by the Idaho State Chamber of Commerce, and the Idaho State AFL-CIO, and Mr. Bollinger won first prize. He was awarded a cash prize and a trip to Washington, D.C., and will arrive tomorrow. His essay will be of interest to all who believe in hiring the handicapped.

The essay follows:

HOW MY COMMUNITY BENEFITS FROM THE ABILITIES OF HANDICAPPED WORKERS

(By Galen Bollinger, Caldwell High School)

A college professor stands in one place for an entire hour to give a lecture to a group of excited premedical students. Standing in a row, some girls proudly play their flutes in our school band. A telephone rings, and a voice reminds the listener of approaching activities of a club. Three laughing boys with magazines under their arms walk out of a small, clean building, and a block away one of their fathers has just purchased some fish files for the weekend trip. An excavating machine noisily takes huge bites of earth so that water will run to new farmland. Many beautifully designed decorations and place cards are on a Christmas dinner table around which finely dressed ladies and gentlemen are seated. With a portable television in his hand, a smiling man walks out of a small shop. What resources have produced these happy, busy activities? To a great extent the abilities of handicapped workers in my community have brought about these events.

A community is a reservoir of the talents and abilities of its people. As the community needs additional abilities, this supply is utilized. In my community handicapped workers have contributed much to our reserve of abilities.

Industry hires several handicapped workers. Some blind men sack seed corn at our large seed company, and a few deaf or crippled workers construct excellent fish files in a local factory.

On main street a crippled mute with cerebral palsy successfully operates a newsstand. In nearby towns a cab dispatcher, a radio and television repairman, a shoe repairman, secretaries, and typists maintain highly productive lives despite severe handicaps. Another man prepares tape recordings for a radio station.

The many-sided life of a college professor has led scores of college students into medical careers and biological vocations. Though crippled for life by polio, this biologist, artist, and lecturer is a highly respected personage of the community.

One young man paralyzed below his waist operates an excavating machine that digs new irrigation and sewer ditches. The work

The DENT view also disregards the growing conviction among school officials from all parts of the country that the District has been shortchanged by exclusion.

Here is what has happened.

At House subcommittee hearings on impacted aid this month, Chairman DENT waved aside District officials seeking about \$4 million in Federal grants for schools overcrowded with children of Government workers here. Maryland suburbs get about \$10 million a year and neighboring towns and counties of Virginia, \$6 million.

The District is on the wrong track when it asks congressional education committees to write the city into the national program, Mr. DENT suggested.

He said the District should take its case to District committees. These committees could recommend, and Congress accept, separation of the city's school budget from its general budget, in Mr. DENT's view. Only then, he thinks, could the District qualify for impacted aid.

SCHOOL SPENDING

Federal grants now are measured, in part, by what local taxpayers spend for their own schools. Mr. DENT reasoned the District could not measure its "local contribution rate" because some \$221 million in local taxes and \$30 million in a Federal payment are pooled for all activities, without earmarking for schools.

There are, however, ways of measuring District taxpayers' contributions to schools. There is the school budget, for example. Tax payments could be apportioned to 88 percent of it and Federal contributions to 12 percent, the same proportion as tax and Federal revenues make up the total general fund.

GRANT BASE

Or the comparable general and school percentages of yield by property taxes could be figured, if Mr. DENT wants a real estate revenue figure to be the grant base, as in the States.

Such computations, however, may turn out to be dry exercises by the time Congress re-vamps the program.

One scheme likely to be advanced by a House Education Study Committee would grant Federal funds on a straight cost-per-pupil basis.

Each federally connected pupil would entitle his school to funds equal to, say 70 or 80 percent, of what his school spends on each of his classmates whose parents are privately employed.

The idea that youngsters of Federal workers cost a community less than children from its private sector is based on the theory that any locality benefits in business, as well as suffers in tax losses, from a Federal plant located there.

SENSIBLE FORMULA

The House will look as much to the study committee as to the Dent subcommittee for a sensible aid formula. And study committeemen—Representatives O'HARA of Michigan and BRADEMAS, of Indiana, both Democrats, and Republican QUINN, of Minnesota—all recognize the District's school needs.

Changes may come along after Congress simply extends for 1 year the current program, which expires June 30.

President Kennedy has asked for major revisions and a 4-year extension. He wants the District added the second year.

In the Senate, administration supporters prefer to wrap revisions up in one big education bill. The District would be part of the package. This strategy wouldn't harm schools drawing budgets for next year. The extension section could be retroactive if the program expired before action on the omnibus bill.

MORSE HEARINGS

Senate Subcommittee Chairman MORSE, Democrat of Oregon, began hearings today.

He probably is the staunchest congressional champion of the District's right to impacted aid. Twice before, he steered through the Senate bills to pay the "impact" on schools of Federal families here. His aids are ready to counter Mr. DENT's position should it prevail in the House.

In pursuing his course, Mr. DENT may arm local Republicans. District GOP leaders already are drafting legislation to order District officials to prepare separate school budgets each year. Their intention was to focus public attention on school needs. Their product could satisfy Mr. DENT's condition for the District's eligibility for impacted aid.

It is not inconceivable that the DENT demand, if he persists, will cast local Republicans into the role of saviors of \$4 million for the city in a Democratic Congress and Democratic administration.

Cuba

FIDEL CASTRO'S CUBA

(Mr. WYMAN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker. I observed the other day on the floor of the House that the only thing Mr. Harriman did not take with him to Moscow on his recent trip to beg Khrushchev's indulgence on Laos was his umbrella. Jack Gore, in Sunday's Fort Lauderdale News, pointed out so well that this kind softness with Khrushchev only helps strengthen Castro's hold on Cuba.

I commend the reading of Mr. Gore's remarks to all those who are deeply concerned by the indecision and timidity of U.S. policy in respect to the Cuban situation.

I continue to believe that we should insist on our inspection of the Island of Cuba on a continuing basis, and if this is denied that we should assure inspection by the use of force if necessary. Beyond this immediate essential, I agree with Mr. Gore that getting Soviet troops out of Cuba is not a solution to the problem of communism in this hemisphere. It should be crystal clear in American foreign policy that we will not tolerate Communist governments in this hemisphere unless they are voted into office in a free election, which never happens.

Mr. Gore wrote:

[From the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News and Sun-Sentinel, May 5, 1963]

SOFT-LINE DIPLOMACY STRENGTHENS RED LIFELINE TO FIDEL CASTRO'S CUBA

When Averell Harriman came back from Russia last week he apparently brought some good news for those who have been advocating our soft-line approach to the problem of getting Russian troops out of Cuba.

Harriman was sent to Moscow to talk to Premier Nikita Khrushchev about the critical situation in Laos. He got no promises from the Soviet leader in regard to Laos, but during their talks Khrushchev and Harriman got around to the subject of Cuba.

Harriman, we presume, was under instructions to remind Khrushchev that the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba was exercising a disturbing influence on the American people and that it would further the cause of peace and help the Kennedy administration out of an embarrassing situation if the Russian leader would bring his armed forces back home.

Khrushchev is reported to have informed Mr. Harriman that he appreciated Mr. Kennedy's efforts to halt the exile raids on Cuba

and to tone down the war threat in the Caribbean. In return, he was reported to have told Harriman he was willing to withdraw Russian troops just as soon as he could do so without losing face or having it appear he was forced into such an action by American pressure.

Thus, according to Mr. Harriman's report, if we wait long enough and don't do anything to offend Khrushchev in the meantime, eventually he will do us a great big favor by withdrawing his troops from Cuba and leaving Castro to manage things on his own.

That is just ducky. If this is really what Khrushchev said it can now be inferred that our do nothing policy with regard to Cuba is going to be continued ad infinitum while we wait for the Soviet Premier to decide when the time is ripe for him to bring his troops back home.

This may be 6 months or a year or more. But, since Khrushchev and President Kennedy apparently have their own little secret about Cuba, it doesn't take any crystal ball expert to hazard the guess that Russian troops could well stay in Cuba until just prior to next year's election when their removal could be trumpeted by the Kennedy administration as another great victory for its soft-line diplomacy.

In the meantime, however, the Commies in Cuba will have tightened their grip on that island to the point where it will be almost unbreakable and they will have spread their evil tentacles into dozens of other places in the Caribbean where they hope to emulate their Cuban success.

This is something our soft-line diplomats don't seem to understand. To them it is a great victory to have forced Russian missiles out of Cuba even though the island, itself, has been surrendered to the Communists as a direct result. And, while we talk about building a wall around Cuba composed of dedicated, freedom-loving people, about the only wall we have built so far is one that keeps these dedicated and freedom-loving people from striking any new blows against an enemy who has taken over their homeland.

Now, those who don't like this policy are told to just be patient and don't rock the boat for Khrushchev appreciates what we are trying to do and will cooperate when he can do so without embarrassing himself.

But what about our embarrassment? Can Americans be anything but red-faced today over the manner in which our longstanding Monroe Doctrine has been trampled underfoot by the Communists? Can they be proud of the way we paid blackmail to a Communist dictator when our whole history shouts against such a precedent? Can they remain tranquil and undisturbed about a Soviet military base right in their own backyard which is now being protected by our own Navy and Air Force? Are we supposed to believe that Nikita Khrushchev is now dealing from the top of the deck and can be trusted when the whole strategy of communism is based upon deceit and deception?

Our people may be naive at times but they are not so naive that they can swallow this Cuban debacle as a great victory for our soft-line diplomacy. It has been no victory in any sense of the word. It has been one of the most humiliating diplomatic defeats this Nation has ever suffered and the magnitude of the defeat gets greater with each day that the Communists are permitted to strengthen their beachhead in this hemisphere.

Getting Soviet troops out of Cuba, if that ever is accomplished, isn't going to settle this Cuban question. It will be a step forward but our responsibility won't end and our self-respect won't be restored until Cuba, itself, is freed from the grip of the Communists and is brought back into the fold of free, democratic nations.

1963

colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA], which is similar to my own H.R. 11631.

Federal aid now goes to some 4,100 school districts represented by more than 300 Members of Congress.

The board of trade states:

Public Law 874, when enacted, was applicable to the territories of Alaska and Hawaii and to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. It has twice been amended to include Wake and Guam.

Here, then, is a case where the Federal taxing power is unjust in its application, because the District of Columbia is denied any of the benefits of a program which it helps pay for and for which it clearly qualifies. It has been excluded from this program during the decade or more of its application. It would seem that the Congress finds it easier to vote funds to send a man to the moon than to provide adequately for education needs of the citizens of the Nation's Capital.

I include several related items as part of my remarks:

THE METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON
BOARD OF TRADE,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1963.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIDNALL: We are very pleased to comply with your request for a copy of the board of trade's letter to the chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee endorsing H.R. 3335, which would include the District of Columbia as a federally impacted area and extend Federal funds for school needs.

If we can be of further assistance to you please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely,
CHARLES E. PHILLIPS,
President.

THE METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON
BOARD OF TRADE,
Washington, D.C., April 19, 1963.

Hon. ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, Committee on Education and
Labor, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. POWELL: The board of directors of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade after careful study has approved a policy in support of H.R. 3335, a bill to extend for 1 additional year the temporary provisions of Public Law 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and to extend their application to the District of Columbia.

In our judgment the District of Columbia clearly qualifies for payment under the provisions of Public Law 874 which provides financial assistance for schools in areas affected by Federal activities. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have advised the committee that their survey indicated that about 30 percent of District of Columbia public school pupils come within the purview of the act. They have also estimated that the District of Columbia would be entitled to a grant of approximately \$4 million in 1963.

The District of Columbia, as I believe the committee knows, has great difficulty meeting school needs because of the significant increases in school population which have taken place and which are projected for the future. During the current school year there has been an increase of 6,000 students, and we expect almost a 30-percent increase during the period 1962-69.

The board of education has estimated building requirements during this period of

approximately \$120 million, and very significant additional annual operating costs.

The District of Columbia shares in the benefits of Federal vocational education laws, the School Lunch Act, and the National Defense Education Act. The District also receives Federal grants through the highway and public welfare programs. In all of these cases and in many others the District of Columbia is treated as a State.

Public Law 874, when enacted, was applicable to the territories of Alaska and Hawaii and to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. It has twice been amended to include Wake and Guam.

We urge the committee to report favorably H.R. 3335.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. PHILLIPS,
President.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 10, 1963]

DISTRICT SEEN LOSING OUT ON IMPACTED AID

Washington probably will not be included in the Federal aid to impacted areas program this year and may not next year unless it alters its system of school financing.

This prediction was made yesterday by Representative JOHN H. DENT, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, Chairman of a House education subcommittee after his group concluded hearings on the 13-year-old program aiding nearly 4,100 school districts impacted with children of Federal installation employees.

DENT said during the hearing he could not "in good conscience" recommend inclusion of Washington in the program unless the House District Committee agrees that the city should have a specific real estate tax for education.

DENT's point was that the District Committee, not the Education Committee, is the House group responsible for Washington finances. He noted that \$19.4 million of the \$30 million Federal payment to the District goes to schools. Under the impact aid program, Washington would get about \$4.5 million.

Helen Samuels, executive secretary of the D.C. Education Association, presented a study showing local school needs. About 30 percent of District school students are children of Federal employees.

"Your fight is really with the House and Senate Committees on District Affairs," DENT said. "If they haven't provided enough money to run this city, it must reflect on their judgment."

DENT said later he does not doubt that District schools need more money. "But if the District had a special tax for school purposes, school officials could then come to us and say, 'This is what our local effort is, and this is how much we could like to be reimbursed in impact aid funds.'"

President Kennedy has recommended that the program be extended 1 year without change and for 3 more years with some changes. He also recommended that Washington be included in the program in fiscal 1965.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 12, 1963]

SHIPLEY ATTACKS SCHOOL AID VOTE

District Republican leader Carl L. Shipley charged yesterday that nonleadership by President Kennedy and the Democratic majority on the House Education and Labor Committee cost the District \$4.5 million in impacted school area aid.

Shipley deplored the failure by the committee to include the District in the Federal aid program despite the fact that it meets all qualifications.

The amount lost to the city "is one thousandth of the amount" the President

would dispense through foreign aid, Shipley said, adding that "our school needs are most urgent and mean more to the national welfare than many of President Kennedy's foreign-aid programs."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Apr. 4, 1963]

CAPITOL EYEING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOL AID

(By Gerald Grant)

House Education and Labor subcommittee members yesterday hinted that the District is not doing enough for its schools.

Representative JOHN H. DENT, Democrat of Pennsylvania, chairman of the subcommittee, which is conducting hearings on Federal aid for impacted school systems, said that before the District can qualify for funds it must establish a tax base for school purposes.

Whereas real estate taxes are generally the base elsewhere, this was not so in Washington, said DENT. Local taxes and the Federal payment are mixed in "one pot," out of which the city's expenses are paid, including those for education.

As a result, Congress is confused about how great a local effort is being made to support the schools, DENT commented. He said it would be difficult for the subcommittee to compute an impacted aid payment without a "tax base earmarked specifically for school purposes."

Arnold C. Sternberg, member of the Democratic Central Committee for the District, testified that his organization had gone on record favoring higher taxes.

Sternberg asserted that it was possible to figure a school tax base by subtracting the Federal percentage share of the District budget—12 percent—from the per pupil cost of educating a child here.

He added that regardless of what local school effort the District was currently making, and in his opinion it was as great as or greater than in most of the states, the city "in equity and fairness" deserved to share in any impacted aid program.

William A. Rich, representing the District Congress of Parents and Teachers, replied to members of the subcommittee who said that whatever the District gained from impacted aid via the Education Committee might be cut from the Federal payment to the city by the District Committee.

Rich said that he did not think this would happen and that the Education Committee must provide "what in justice" is owed District schoolchildren.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star,
Apr. 29, 1963]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STILL HOPES TO GET IMPACTED SCHOOL AID

(By Grace Bassett)

The District still is in the running for "Federally impacted" school aid, despite the restraining hand of a House Education Subcommittee chairman.

The chairman, Representative DENT, Democrat of Pennsylvania, doesn't think Washington can qualify for inclusion in the program.

City officials feel they can meet his objections statistically. More to the point, the conditions he says the city fails to meet may themselves be junked by Congress in an overhaul of impacted aid standards.

JUDGMENT REJECTED

Mr. DENT's doubts about the District reject the judgment of President Kennedy, Health, Education and Welfare Secretaries Ribicoff and Celebrezze, the full Senate, District Commissioners, the District Board of Education and School Superintendent Carl Hansen, as well as many members of Mr. DENT's own House Education Committee.

1963

7445

That isn't going to be an easy thing to do at this late date. And if we wait for Nikita Khrushchev to make it easier for us, we're doomed for a long, long wait and in the meantime we'll probably have several more Cubans spawned at our doorstep.

JACK W. GORE.

SEPARATE BUDGET FOR THE SCHOOL SYSTEM OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would provide for a separate budget for the school system of the District of Columbia. This legislation and report is the result of some discussions that I have had with political leaders and others vitally interested in the school system and in solving the problems in the schools here in the District. I am in substantial agreement with the findings and recommendations of these interested citizens.

Because the fiscal problem of the District, and this is the major problem of the school system, needs immediate consideration I am introducing this bill today to provide for a separate school budget. This bill will also provide that before the budget is presented to the Bureau of the Budget the people who live here and pay taxes locally may have the right to have a hearing and have a chance to counsel with the school authorities who are presenting the budget. I have been making some special studies of the problems in the schools here myself, spending many hours visiting schools, considering school problems, looking at budget recommendations, interviewing students, teachers, and principals. This special project has been quite revealing to me and I will be presenting a detailed report of these school visits in the near future. I have visited 10 schools in the District of Columbia and will be visiting more in the future.

A major step in working out the educational problems of the District will be the enactment of a law establishing an elected school board. Until an elected school board is provided for, this proposal will give some say to the local citizens and will work into the establishment of an elected school board very well.

Mr. Speaker, the following analysis and information is very revealing—it is correct and it needs the sincere consideration of every Member of this House:

CONSIDERATIONS IN FAVOR OF A SEPARATE SCHOOL BUDGET FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(A report prepared by a special subcommittee of the D.C. Republican State Committee for the District of Columbia, on a separate school budget for the District of Columbia.)

A PICTURE OF OUR SCHOOL SYSTEM

The Washington, D.C., public school system is today the result of years of neglect in the face of a rapidly growing school population.

A city that is plagued with a growing crime rate, a critical juvenile delinquency problem, and overburdened public welfare problem and an increasing sense of frustration and demoralization had better do something about its schools.

In 1948 the school population in Washington public schools was 88,243. In 1963 the school population has risen to 131,814 and it is anticipated that it will increase by 1968 to 163,000.

In 1948, the schools were overcrowded by about 4½ percent. That is to say, there were about 4½ percent more pupils than there were existing school buildings designed to house them. This year, 1963, there are 25½ percent more pupils than there are existing school buildings designed to house them. By 1958, overcrowding will be increased to nearly 57 percent of capacity if no school buildings are being built.

At the elementary school level 73 percent of the children attend overcrowded schools; 25 percent of them are in schools overcrowded by 25 percent or more. At the junior high school level, 96½ percent of the children are in overcrowded schools; 37 percent are in junior high schools overcrowded by more than 25 percent; and 2,800 junior high school students have to be housed in senior high school buildings.

This year some 2,600 students have had to go to school only one-half day because of classroom shortages. Over the past 7 years over 22,000 students have been put on part-time schedules. If 2,800 junior high school students had not been housed in available senior high school buildings, over 9,000 junior high school students at 6 schools would have had to go to junior high school part time.

Beginning students cannot get into kindergartens. This year almost 800 were turned away; and many others simply did not apply, because of the problem. Over the last 7 years nearly 5,000 students have had to be turned away from kindergarten.

There are 171 school buildings of all kinds in Washington. By October 1968, 58 of these buildings or more than one-third will, unless replaced or modernized, be 60 or more years of age. Some 31,000 of the city's 131,000 children are housed in these buildings. At the elementary school level, this accounts for 40 percent of the school population.

Anyone who has taken the trouble to look at the old schools can see their condition. From "Horrible Hine" on down the list, they have inadequate toilets, broken windows, broken water fountains, inadequate equipment, lack of playgrounds, dingy halls. The list goes on.

Under a title headed "Studied Neglect," Time magazine on March 22, 1963, made this comment about Washington schools: "At Pierce School, a 69-year-old brick building with patched walls, peeling paint, and wrapping paper for window shades, nearly 400 students go to school in the classrooms built for 200. On the third floor of Hine School (nicknamed 'Horrible Hine') the litter and debris from a 1959 fire have yet to be cleaned up. The city's school dropout rate is 39 percent; discipline is so precarious that school officials have been forced to call for police aid nearly 300 times so far this school-year."

While teaching salaries can always be higher, and have risen more slowly than is the case in comparable school systems, school salary levels in the District schools are good in comparison with the 20 largest cities in the country and with teaching salaries in the surrounding counties. Yet it continues to be difficult to attract teachers here. Approximately 35 percent of all teachers are temporary. This is twice what the rate should be. Recently, 315 openings were available for teachers, and only 224 reported

to take the examination. Past experience indicates that only one-half of these will not prove qualified. Results of recruitment in colleges this spring were that more than one-half of the graduates to whom offers were made, declined to come here to teach.

Classes are overcrowded, and there is a woeful inadequacy in the special service programs, libraries, text books, physical education, languages, shop, science, counseling, shortage of principals, and aides of all kinds.

Even the period in which the District of Columbia is able to make commitments to hire teachers works against the teacher employment problem. Because of the present system of handling the budget, our schools are unable to contract for the services of experienced teachers in May, when most of them prefer to complete plans for the succeeding school year. Normally commitments cannot be made until almost the end of August, because of the budget procedures, for the school year commencing in September.

HOW DID IT GET THIS WAY—WHAT'S BEING DONE ABOUT IT?

The Board of Education has proposed over the past 6 years, 1958-63, for buildings and equipment, a total of \$90 million, an average of \$15 million each year, for new schools, replacements, and additions to schools. Over the same period, the Commissioners cut these requests down to a total of \$52 million, almost \$40 million less than was requested. When these budgets were presented to Congress, Congress approved nearly the amount that the Commissioners requested, about \$50 million.

Currently, the Board of Education has proposed a program of \$120 million over the next 6 years for schools, buildings, and equipment, approximately \$20 million a year, to take up the results of neglect of past years and to anticipate the accelerating growth of school population.

In October 1962, the Board of Education asked for \$23 million for schools, buildings, and equipment, for the 1963-64 year. The President's final budget, as approved by the Commissioners, asks only \$2.3 million for schools, buildings, and equipment; although \$14.7 million is asked conditionally, "provided additional funds are made available to the District."

Some 54 building programs are asked for in the 6-year program. This year's unconditional request, provides for actual constructions of three school buildings.

WHAT'S THE MATTER WITH THIS?

Bearing in mind the prime importance that public schools have to all of us, as compared with everything else in our community, it appears that the school budget suffers because it is considered "as just another item" in the whole budget that the Commissioners have to deal with. One wonders whether some of the programs that the taxpayers pay for have quite the importance to our city that sound school buildings do—such as a \$19 million stadium on which the city had to pay \$460,000 in interest, or bridges and highways costing hundreds of millions.

Almost without exception, school budgets in other communities are handled separate and apart from every other item of Government business. The school budget is handled, in other communities, by the school board, separate taxes are levied for schools, the budget hearings are held separately, and the school board in those communities has the complete control and responsibility for it.

The District of Columbia Board of Education loses any control over its budget from the time it leaves their hands in October of each year, and from that time on, has next to nothing to say about the dispensation of the funds.

Considering that Congress has over the past 6 years given the Commissioners nearly every dollar that they asked for for school buildings and equipment, it may be reasonably inferred that the fault, at least in the first instance, in the \$40-million cut in the building program over that period may be laid to the Commissioners and the \$20 million or \$9 million cut proposed in the program for next year may be placed there, as well.

Whatever may be argued (whether the competing demands of all other city items make it necessary to cut the school budget, or whether the Commissioners are only asking what they believe will be appropriated by Congress), it would seem better to ask Congress for the actual needs of our schools. If the vitally important school budget is permitted to stand on its own merits without suffering from the competing demands of other city services, it is believed that the school needs presented in a separate school budget would focus the attention of the President, Congress, and the community on school needs. And, this is not being done now.

WHAT IS THE PRESENT BUDGET PROCEDURE?

The existing law requires the Board of Education to make up its budget request for all items by the first of October and to submit the same to the Commissioners. It is then submitted to the District Budget Office which makes its cuts and then submitted to the Commissioners for further cutting, before the school budget, along with everything else in the city budget, is submitted to Congress. Congress normally passes the final city (including the school) budget by August of the following year.

WHAT DOES THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR A SEPARATE SCHOOL BUDGET DO?

First, the proposed legislation bypasses the Commissioners and the rest of the city budget, so that a school budget can be presented directly to the Congress.

Second, the proposed legislation puts the school budget on an April 1 fiscal year so that hopefully the separate appropriation for it will be passed not later than May, and prior to the rest of the city budget.

Third, the proposed legislation calls for the transmission of the school budget to Congress in January, so that there is a compressed period during which public attention can be focused on the budget and school needs. Also, this will bring the period between the original proposal and action by Congress down from almost 10 months to 4 months.

We think this legislation will do the following important things:

1. It will separate the school needs and the school budget from all other consideration in the city.
2. It will focus direct attention on school needs.
3. It will keep the school budget from passing through undesirable administrative reducing steps, before presentation to Congress.
4. It will give to the Board of Education the direct responsibility to Congress and the community for the budget and its administration, and relieve the Commissioners of the problem.
5. It will give a chance to hire teachers in May instead of August readying the budget

4 months before school opening rather than a few weeks.

It seems reasonable to suppose that over the years, the money appropriated for schools will increase to meet school needs.

We hope this will be one important step in resurrecting the Washington school system.

Submitted and prepared by the special subcommittee of the Republican State Commit-

tee for the District of Columbia on a separate school budget for the District of Columbia.

GILBERT HAHN, Jr., Chairman.
Mrs. RUTH B. SPENCER.
Mrs. JOSEPHINE PENNINGTON.
Miss KATHRYN E. BOWERS.
Miss RUTH M. BROWN.
Col. ROBERT L. POLLARD.
Dr. HENRY S. ROBINSON, Jr.
Mr. CLARENCE E. SHAW.

TABLE 10.—Amounts requested by the Board of Education for capital outlay and permanent improvements, the amounts approved by the Commissioners, and the sums actually appropriated by Congress, by fiscal year

Year	Board of Education request	Approved by Commissioners	Percentage	Appropriated by Congress	Percentage
1938.....	\$14,963,000	\$8,004,500	53.5	\$10,642,722	71.1
1939.....	14,033,125	9,748,000	69.5	8,920,300	63.6
1940.....	15,596,389	9,522,000	61.1	6,911,000	44.3
1941.....	14,397,497	7,194,000	50.0	6,944,000	48.2
1942.....	12,316,366	9,229,000	74.9	8,886,000	72.1
1943.....	18,383,110	7,651,000	43.2	7,693,000	41.8
1944.....	23,083,200	14,725,600	63.4		

¹ In the President's District of Columbia budget, 1964, only \$2,309,000 (10 percent of the amount requested by the Board of Education) was approved by the Commissioners and the White House unless additional revenue is made available to the District. The amount shown is the total recommended by the President if his proposals regarding sources of income are approved by Congress.

TABLE 6.—List of capital outlay items included in the unconditional and contingent proposals in the President's budget message, 1964

School	Purpose	A. Unconditional	B. Contingent	Total
Garrison Elementary Replacement.....	Equipment.....	\$61,000		
Evans Junior High.....	do.....	187,000		
Harris Elementary.....	do.....	71,000		
Green Elementary.....	do.....	65,000		
Hart Junior High addition.....	do.....	132,000		
Rudolph Elementary addition.....	Plans and specifications, construction, and equipment.....	194,000		
Hendley Elementary addition.....	do.....	200,000		
Rabaut Junior High.....	Construction.....		\$3,200,000	
Roper Junior High.....	do.....		3,350,000	
Kimball Elementary addition.....	Plans and specifications, and construction.....	615,000		
Hine Junior High replacement.....	Construction.....		2,340,000	
Raymond Elementary addition.....	Plans and specifications.....	55,000		
17th and E Sts. N.E., elementary.....	do.....	98,800		
Powell Elementary addition.....	Plans and specifications, construction, and equipment.....		453,000	
16th and Irving Sts. N.W., Junior High.....	Site and plans and specifications.....		1,548,000	
13th and Alabama Ave. S.E., Junior High.....	Plans and specifications.....		268,000	
55th and Eads St. N.E., senior high.....	Site.....		830,000	
Denning Elementary replacement.....	do.....	17,800		
Permanent improvements.....		614,200	427,000	\$941,200
Total.....		2,309,000	12,416,600	14,725,600

YOUNG AMERICAN MEDAL FOR BRAVERY AWARDED TO PARENTS OF JOHN NICHOLAS ARAMINO OF LE ROY, N.Y.

(Mr. OSTERTAG (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I have earlier today attended a moving ceremony at the White House to honor posthumously a teen-aged young man from Le Roy, N.Y., who heroically sacrificed his life to save a young companion from

almost certain death under the wheels of an onrushing locomotive. The occasion was the award by the President of the United States of the Young American Medal for Bravery to the parents of John Nicholas Aramino, Jr., for his ultimate sacrifice in May of 1961. The youth, only 17 years of age, was the son of Mr. and Mrs. John J. Aramino, of Le Roy, in Genesee County, State of New York.

This marked the first posthumous award in the 11-year history of the Young American Medals program, which was established by Congress to provide recognition for boys and girls under 19 who perform outstanding acts of bravery

A2802

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 7

Cuban people and our help to them in this hour of great, great need.

With best personal regards and thanks for your leadership.

Most sincerely,

ANSLEY GERARD VAN DYKE,

Lee's Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Daily Advance in Lynchburg on Thursday, April 25, 1963, in connection with the bill I introduced to restore the full citizenship posthumously of Gen. Robert E. Lee.

The editorial follows:

LEE'S CIVIL RIGHTS

Confederate Memorial Day is observed tomorrow as a holiday in Alabama, Florida, Georgia and Mississippi. Its arrival invariably brings forth moving eulogies for Robert E. Lee, whose dilemma when forced to choose between duty to his country and duty to his State epitomized the tragedy of the War Between the States.

Lee's acceptance as a national rather than a sectional hero is almost complete. Former President Eisenhower and President Kennedy both have gone out of their way to voice their esteem for the memory of the Confederate chieftain. Back in 1957 Ike expressly dissociated himself from a remark of Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery that Lee should have been "sacked" for his conduct of the Battle of Gettysburg. And the same year J.F.K., then a Senator, cosponsored a bill to give back to Lee full rights of citizenship.

This year Representative JAMES H. QUILLEN, a Tennessee Republican, introduced a bill which would restore full citizenship rights posthumously to Lee. Its passage would represent a splendid gesture although such action certainly couldn't add any lustre to a matchless Virginia name.

In fact, such a proposal in past years has never advanced very far in Congress primarily because of Southern opposition. Senator ROBERTSON declined to become a cosponsor of the 1957 bill, which was introduced by Indiana's Senator Capehart. At the time he quoted Dr. Douglas Southall Freeman, Lee's distinguished biographer, to the effect that no action was necessary to restore Lee's citizenship because that was done automatically when he signed the parole in which he agreed not to bear arms against the United States.

Theoretically, Lee would not have been able to exercise certain of the rights of citizenship without taking an oath, because his application for a pardon apparently never came to the attention of President Andrew Johnson and wasn't acted upon. But Dr. Freeman concluded that Lee was so highly esteemed in his native State and community that no one there would have interposed objection if he had sought to exercise any normal citizenship right.

Senator ROBERTSON's belief was that any attempt to restore Lee's full civil rights "would be at best an empty gesture" and also "might be misinterpreted by many people as an effort to restore citizenship itself."

A Pattern of the Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I attach herewith a very pertinent editorial which was a guest editorial in the Decatur, Ill., Herald, of May 4, 1963, from an earlier edition of the Wall Street Journal.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I know exactly what they are talking about in this editorial. The competition of U.S. lines with foreign rivals has been tremendous. Our lines have operated a number of years without subsidy, while all the competitors throughout the world are either subsidized or government-owned; in either case they are able to survive regardless of rates or competitive conditions.

If we are to keep our oversea and world lines operating we do have to make it possible for them to compete with foreign lines, some of which were created at times when we were supplying foreign aid. In effect, we should have reduced foreign aid by the amount that those foreign lines were subsidized. It doesn't appear to me that any country who is receiving U.S. aid ought to be creating an international airline when there are plenty of them which are operating now without being a drag on the economy. There is nothing more important than freeing our own lines from some of the rigid rules under which they now operate to allow health and growth for those U.S. lines.

The editorial follows:

[From the Decatur (Ill.) Herald, May 5, 1963]

A PATTERN OF THE PAST

A White House policy statement declared the other day that the Government intended to do all it could to help U.S. international airlines maintain their "health and growth." But whatever cheer the airlines may have found in those words was soon dissipated.

From the standpoint of the U.S. lines, a further stimulus to creation of new foreign airlines cannot help but increase the existing overcapacity on world air routes. Largely as a result of rising capacity of foreign lines, U.S. airlines in 1961 handled only 49 percent of passengers flown between the United States and foreign points, down from 70 percent in 1951.

Well, it's one thing to encourage competition. It's quite another to subsidize the U.S. lines' foreign rivals. Especially when the White House statement fails to accord the American lines much flexibility to meet the intensifying competitive conditions.

These conditions are particularly severe on the transatlantic run, shared by Trans-World Airlines and Pan American World Airways with a growing host of foreign carriers. TWA has been having its financial troubles for some time and, together with Pan Am has concluded that a merger would be a good idea.

Through a merger, they reason, they would achieve sizable economies and, perhaps, be

able to compete more effectively. But the Government clings to its old rigid rule that there should be more than one U.S. line flying each major route, apparently dooming the TWA-Pan Am proposal.

Subsidies for the foreign lines and rigid rules for their U.S. competitors seem an odd way to promote "health and growth" of U.S. airlines. No businessman can compete for long if he's frozen in a pattern of the past.

Congress Must Be Made Aware of Pay Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal Register of April 27, 1963:

CONGRESS MUST BE MADE AWARE OF PAY FACTS

Every effort should be made now to assure that when the service pay bill comes before the House, within the next week or two, every Member will be aware of the shortcomings that prevent this legislation from accomplishing its original objective.

We hope and expect, of course, that there will be members of the Armed Services Committee who will put up a vigorous fight in behalf of a stronger and more effective bill. But their task will be aided greatly if the individual members are apprised in advance of the weaknesses of the measure and what needs to be done. This can be accomplished if their individual constituents and patriotic organizations in their areas write to them now setting forth the facts.

It is certain that the legislators will be impressed by the plea of the captain of the ill-fated submarine *Thresher*, as revealed in last week's Journal and Register. The hazards of peace time service and the devotion with which the low paid men of the Armed Forces perform their duties are exemplified in the tragic loss of these sailors.

We hope, too, that the Members of Congress will read the letter which J. & R. Congressional Editor Louis R. Stockstill wrote to Chairman CARL VINSON of the House Armed Services Committee, at the latter's request. In this, Mr. Stockstill has revealed the weaknesses of the argument against re-computation of retired pay. Mr. Stockstill points out that members of the Armed Forces regard Chairman VINSON "as the greatest champion they have ever had" and he expresses the hope that Mr. VINSON will change his view on this aspect of the pay bill.

It is important to note, as reported extensively in this issue of the Journal and Register, that Service witnesses before the House Appropriations Committee, while looking upon pay increases as a keystone to improving career incentives, are also insistent that, to be effective, pay increases should be backed up by improvements to other career incentives. These include better family medical and dental care, safeguarding retirement benefits, offsetting high living costs, ironing out promotion inequalities, and many other morale areas.

The danger in the present situation is that if the services do not get a good pay bill now, it will be some years before they can hope for improvement. Meanwhile, losses will continue, morale will suffer, training costs will increase, and combat effectiveness will suffer.

The Fallacy of Unequal Pay**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch has been a consistent and vigorous advocate of legislation to assure equal pay for women when doing the same work as men. As a sponsor of equal pay legislation, and as a woman, I am proud to have the help of this outstanding newspaper in behalf of equal pay.

Recently, in discussing some of the arguments used by some business spokesmen in opposing the proposed law, the Post-Dispatch said it is "undeniably true" that costs of employment are higher for women than for men, but added: "The question is whether it is relevant." The editorial then stated that the norm in employment costs is, and has to be, a combination of male and female employment costs, "for industry and business could not get their work done without women who now represent about a third of the entire work force."

Mr. Speaker, I think the Post-Dispatch editorial makes some excellent points. However, from my own experience in the business community as director of training for the comptometer firm in St. Louis prior to my marriage, I personally doubt that, in a great many jobs where men and women do the same work, the true costs of employing women are any higher than the costs of employing men. Even so, wages in those positions are usually much lower for women. The discrimination is unfair and should be ended. I am glad that the House Committee on Education and Labor has again approved an equal pay bill.

I submit for inclusion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Speaker, the editorial referred to, "The Fallacy of Unequal Pay," from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 27, 1963, as follows:

THE FALLACY OF UNEQUAL PAY

An argument being raised against equal pay for women legislation in House hearings, that costs of employment are higher for women than for men, is undeniably true. The question is whether it is relevant. The notion that pay for comparable work ought to fluctuate with employment costs is, we believe, untenable, and if applied generally—and not just to women—would produce a reasonable facsimile of chaos.

It is a fiction to maintain that male employment costs constitute a norm. If there is a norm, it is a combination of male and female employment costs, for industry and business could not get their work done without women, who now represent about a third of the entire work force. If they were withdrawn from work employers would face a labor shortage of severely critical proportions.

There is, furthermore, every reason in self-interest for employers to offer women the incentive of equal pay, for in the coming 7 years they will require 6 million additional women employees, an increase of 25 percent, according to the estimate of Secretary of Labor Wirtz.

Women are guaranteed equal pay by law in 22 States and under 40 percent of collective bargaining agreements, but 21 million of the 24,500,000 women workers in this country are outside the protection of labor unions. It is upon them that the burden of unequal pay falls most heavily, and as Secretary Wirtz says they are the ones least able to bear it.

A Federal equal pay law will stop exploitation of the weak bargaining position of these millions of underpaid women workers, increase national purchasing power, and enhance the ability of employers to attract into their service the millions of new women workers they will be needing in the next few years. Unequal pay for equal work is an injustice unworthy of the greatest industrial country in the world, and Congress should act forthrightly to redress it.

Bill Would Retain Inequity**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Columbus, Ga., Enquirer:

BILL WOULD RETAIN INEQUITY

The Enquirer has wholeheartedly supported the proposal for increased pay to active and retired service personnel. The Defense Department outlined its request for the increases last year and submitted it to Congress in January with high hopes for passage of all details.

However, the bill that has now emerged from the House Armed Services Committee does not fill the need cited by the Defense Department nor covered in an earlier bill drawn up by a subcommittee.

A particular point on which the committee's version departs from the Defense Department request is in the matter of retirement pay for personnel who left the service before June 1, 1958.

The 1958 bill, which was the last service pay increase, failed to give men who had already retired the same consideration as those retiring after the new rates went into effect.

The Defense Department had hoped to correct this inequity by including in the new bill a provision to allow men who retired before June 1958 to recompute their benefits on current pay levels.

However, the committee knocked out this provision and recommended an across-the-board 5-percent increase which would retain the difference in the rate of retirement pay received by men who retired before June 1958 and thus perpetuate the inequity.

It is simply a question of providing a uniform rate for all retirees rather than drawing a line and saying those who come after this date deserve more benefits.

The full House should correct this shortcoming of the committee bill.

Also, eliminated by the committee were requests for special pay to personnel subject to hostile fire, special pay for duty involving unusual hardship, and additional uniform and subsistence allowance for officers.

Congress is actually toying with the idea of voting more money for machinery than the Defense Department requested. It should at least vote as much as was asked for the men who must serve if our Nation keeps its place in the world, and for those who have won our wars of the past.

The Cuban Situation**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 7, 1963

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, amid all the tumult and shouting it is difficult to appreciate the facts in the Cuban situation and the attitude of our country toward it. However, to those of us who are fortunate to have friends in a position to analyze the situation because of their connections, the real seriousness of the possibilities involved in our relationship to that unhappy country are somewhat clarified. I am blessed with the friendship of such an individual who is an outstanding citizen, the minister of the Presbyterian Church of Toms River, Ocean County, N.J., Rev. Ansley Gerard Van Dyke. Over the years Dr. Van Dyke, through the missionary work of his church, has been in close touch with developments in Cuba. Recently I received a letter from him, dated April 19, 1963, and with his permission I am pleased to have the privilege of inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope my colleagues will read it because it represents the considered opinion of a dedicated man with a calm analytical mind. He does not preach pessimism but being a stalwart American is unequivocally opposed to communism and its godless ideology.

The letter follows:

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF
TOMS RIVER,

Toms River, N.J., April 19, 1963.

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: I have just finished reading the text of the statement of Sr. Jose Miro Cardona as it was published this morning in the New York Times. I cannot help believe that much of what he has said there is absolutely true. Many of my Cuban friends know him to be a very sincere, capable lawyer and one who is not given to volcanic outbursts of temper.

It should go without saying that the average layman cannot be adept at international politics. But one does not need very good glasses to see that our national policy has been altered a great deal recently in regards to communism in this hemisphere. If there have been changes made, then I believe every citizen has a right to know what they are.

I am writing you to see if you can shed any light for me on this matter. I am very much concerned, as you well know, about the Cuban situation, because of our church's work there, and because of my many friends there and here who still hope to return to a free Cuba. What is our present policy toward coexistence with communism in this hemisphere? Why do we spend millions in Laos and other faraway places and then allow communism to entrench itself on our very doorstep?

Don't send this letter on to the State Department as you did last summer. Their replies are so vague and ultimately meaningless that it isn't fair to take up their time to reply. But I do plead with you to use all your ability and influence to undergird the trustworthiness of our commitments to the